



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND.

### V.<sup>1</sup>

MY last report upon educational movements in England was occupied with four distinct fields of interest—the re-organization of the University of London, the growth of the new education department, consequential parliamentary legislation, and the vigorous efforts to establish a basis, or, shall we say, a rallying point for that elusive union of educational parties which all pretend to desire but so few are willing to achieve.

As I write, ten months have passed away, the curtain has risen and fallen many times—rising in hope, falling in despair—and the scene is wholly changed. The general educational council is dead, slain by “them of its own household,” by the apathy, not to say the pusillanimity, of the very leaders of education, who began by blessing it as “the one thing to be desired above all others.” At the last public meeting, in January of this year, the attempt to give the primary schools a representation in just proportion to their numbers and organization proved too much for the magnanimity of the rank and file of secondary educationists. Though the originator of the idea and a few stalwarts endeavored to recast the constitution, defections rapidly increased, and the fruition of this excellent effort for educational solidarity had to be left, as so often in the history of the world, to later days, younger hands, and the fostering care of a ripener public opinion.

In the three other fields of interest, though life is not extinct, and may even be described as vigorous, the good old tag, *parturit mons nascitur ridiculus mus*, is ever in mind of the thoughtful spectator. Parliament and the new education department have travailed, but neither can be said to have brought forth much more than windy promises.

A secondary education bill we have; but gods and men

<sup>1</sup> See SCHOOL REVIEW, January and November, 1900.

alike are dissolved in laughter at the weakling offspring of the largest parliamentary majority of modern times. A secondary inspectorate we have, but, after the British manner, proportionate only to the needs of the current day and hour, and in no way calculated to instil respect or inspire enthusiasm by its strength or brilliance. Lastly, it was not until eight months had elapsed that the reorganization committee of the University of London accomplished the selection of three higher officials, while London watched and waited for the constitution of its metropolitan university. Happily, now that this first choice of extraordinary difficulty has been effected, things are moving more rapidly, and there is some promise of really practical developments in the autumn. To these I will return; but some minor features of current educational history may be disposed of briefly.

First among these minor matters is the intrusion of the omnipresent "khaki" into the field of education. It may seem uncharitable to insinuate commercialism where the alleged motive is pure patriotism; but there can be no doubt that the prevalence of war fever afforded the great public schools an excellent opportunity for exploiting their army-classes and the attached cadet corps. The headmaster's conference of last January, not unjustly described as a "khaki conference," gave a vigorous push to the ball which the war fever started, and which a fervid rivalry among the headmasters has kept rolling. But the government, mindful of its master the taxpayer, looked coldly upon the proposed scheme of military instruction, and the wearisome prolongation of the war would seem to have damped down the original ardor. Little is heard now on the subject, and the net result is only the private benefit of certain schools which keep their fingers on the pulse of public opinion and profit accordingly in due season. National education cannot be said to have been materially affected.

Security of tenure, a very old and vexed question, has again come to the front. Some arbitrary dismissals at Alleyn's School, Dulwich, aroused public opinion and stimulated the government early in the year to promise a bill next session dealing with

dismissals, and giving a right of appeal. But Sir John Gorst expressly refused to include teachers in schools under the endowed schools acts, thereby again illustrating the government contempt for that section of English education which, being unorganized, is unable to exert political pressure. Public indignation was further stimulated when seven professors and lecturers of the Engineering College at Cooper's Hill, with a record of services varying from nine to thirty years, were dismissed at a term's notice by a minute of the India Office. Economy with increased efficiency was the ostensible reason. Eventually the government yielded to the pressure of public opinion, and withdrew the edict of dismissal pending a supplementary report from the board of visitors of the college, who were, moreover, strengthened by the addition of representatives of the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, and London. But it soon appeared that there was no real grit in the intentions of the government, and consequently when the bill which they introduced in the summer was opposed by the voluntary school interest they hastened to avail themselves of this opposition as an excuse for dropping the bill. The opposition seems to have been prompted by the fear that, under the proposed bill, it would be impossible to get rid of inefficient teachers; but the bill contemplated little more than a justification of dismissals by school managers on appeal to the board of education. Doubtless, and not unnaturally, the voluntary school managers did not care to be saddled with the task of justification.

But even the perennial question of security of tenure has been thrown into the shade by the educational *cause célèbre* popularly known at "Regina *vs.* Cockerton," which has convulsed the elementary school world. The manifold subtleties of this dispute would be neither intelligible nor interesting to American readers. The main points are briefly these (I quote from an excellent exposition in the *Journal of Education* for January, 1901):

School boards generally, since the time of Mr. Mundella's vice-presidency (of the committee of the privy council on education) have considered that they have been justified in spending the rate raised under the act of 1870

upon day and evening science and art classes not earning a Whitehall grant, but a South Kensington grant, because (*inter alia*) the term "elementary school" in that act was defined to mean a school or department in which "elementary education is the *principal* part of the education there given." The school boards have interpreted this definition as meaning that, as long as 51 per cent. of the children learn only elementary subjects, 49 per cent. may be having a university education in the board school at the cost of the rates. Others say that the meaning of the words is that any child in the school, if he spends (say) 90 per cent. of his time in learning elementary subjects, may spend 10 per cent. of his time on more advanced subjects. In any case, the act of 1890 removes the "principal part" restriction from evening schools as a condition for a *parliamentary* grant.

Now the parliamentary grant for evening continuation schools, as regards science at any rate, is only given on condition (*vide* evening continuation school code) that the instruction is more elementary than that of South Kensington. Hence we have the question: Is the money raised by school board rate strictly parallel in its expenditure to that given by parliamentary grant under Whitehall regulations; so that when a child is not earning an attendance grant from Whitehall during that period of time he is not a fit subject for school board expenditure?

The question came to the front in London in this wise: The London school board adopted the *free* system for its science and art classes, which the other school boards have not done. Hence the polytechnics, or other fee-charging schools of science and art, rapidly lost their pupils, while the school board classes cost the rates a large sum to supply the loss of fees. The Camden School of Art, in particular, took exception to the expenditure at Medburn Street Higher Grade School. The city corporation also objected generally to the rate expenditure on such higher education. The auditor, on the motion of these objectors, disallowed seven items, but in only three cases was the question fought out in court. The parties concerned agreed that the questions for the court were: (1) Whether it was within the powers of the board as a statutory corporation to provide science and art schools or classes, either in day schools or in continuation schools; (2) whether it was lawful for them to pay the expenses of maintaining these schools or classes out of the school board rate or school fund; (3) whether the rule *nisi* should be made absolute in regard to any or what disallowances and surcharges.

The judgment was unanimous against the school board. It was decided that Whitehall and South Kensington were absolutely distinct as regards these parliamentary grants, and that school boards existed only to earn the Whitehall grant. Mr. Justice Wills put the point clearly when he said that school boards existed only for obligatory purposes, and that they are "under no obligation to go beyond the subjects of the education code."

The question arises now, what will be the practical result if this judg-

ment is maintained in the higher courts? It will not necessarily shut up a single higher grade or continuation school. In many of the towns of the north it will not even inconvenience these schools. Where the school board act simply as managers, taking fees from all scholars, and getting a grant from the borough council under the technical instruction or local taxation acts, the schools will go on as heretofore. Such schools need cost the rates nothing; in fact, may even save the rates. The school that must cease is the free school and the school which ignores the local authority and its funds.

These are the facts of the original controversy and a fair statement of its real scope and probable consequences. The advocates of the school board forthwith raised the cry of wholesale ruin. The whole system of higher-grade schools had received a fatal blow, and, incidentally, continuation schools for adults had been shown to be illegally charged to the cost of the ratepayer, no charge for any thing beyond absolutely elementary education being legal. The matter was complicated by the more or less conscious connivance of the old education department. The immediate result of the decision against the school boards was to produce a dead-lock. Rightly handled this dead-lock would have provided the president of the council, the Duke of Devonshire, with "the one new factor that would enable him to force the claims of education upon a ministry that has hitherto shown scant sympathy in this direction." What he has accomplished toward seizing his opportunity will be seen presently.

Meanwhile, the London school board having decided not to appeal to the House of Lords, for the present the Cockerton judgment is law. But the danger of chaos in the autumn has been obviated by an ingenious evasion of the spirit of the judgment in London, and in the eight county boroughs concerned an arrangement with the local authorities for technical education to carry on the schools next winter will be the probable solution. In the former case the device employed is to teach under the syllabus of the science and art department's directory, but register the examinees under the Whitehall code and the act. By this plan the science and art department grant is sacrificed, but expenses are defrayed by an increased claim under the Whitehall code, which is met quite legitimately though at the

expense of the ratepayer, by the rates. Thus higher-grade education is saved, but the ratepayer suffers from the Cockerton judgment. At the same time the school board successfully asserts the principle which it vainly fought for at the Cockerton trial, *i. e.*, that "there is no essential difference between the science and drawing of the Whitehall code and the science and art of the science and art department directory." Whereas, however, formerly to the rates and the board of education grants under the code was added the aid of the science and art department grant, now this last aid is withdrawn and must be made good by an increased demand on the rates.

Such being the state of affairs, the government has practically traversed the whole position by issuing a new minute (no longer called a "code") establishing evening schools and classes. The full significance of this minute is ably explained by Mr. H. Macan in the *Journal of Education* for August; but the leading points are embodied in the following preamble to his article:

The board of education, taking advantage of the Cockerton judgment, have boldly adopted the recommendations of the Bryce commission, that continuation schools are "secondary" and not "elementary." This implies *control* by the secondary authority, but leaves the *management* in primary or other hands, as the commission also recommended.

The minute divides the schools into two kinds. The main kind (Articles 1 to 20) is secondary, and is no longer "public elementary." Hence the Cockerton judgment no longer applies to this class; the school board rate (with certain exceptions) is not available; and the words "code," "obligatory," "standard," etc., are abolished as meaningless.

The second, or subsidiary kind (Article 21), is given to school boards for the hardness of their hearts; if they reject the license of the bill, reject the proffered grants of the county councils, and stand (as Canon Barnett well has it) on their dignity, they come under the judgment, and get as their reward a puny, truncated, fifteen-year age elementary continuation school. No school board (*pace* Leeds and Gateshead) is going to persist in seeking this alternative; though the argument "we won't play" is being freely used in their parliamentary game of bluff.

What does the secondary continuation school become [continues Mr. Macan], and what will it do? (1) *As a secondary school*, it passes from Whitehall to South Kensington jurisdiction, and loses any religious denominational character it may have had. (2) *As a school outside the code*, all those

financial-political restrictions introduced into the elementary school by way of regulating the proportions between imperial and local subsidies vanish. (3) *As a school under the "Directory,"* Clause VII at once applies. Every county council in the rural counties will at once become "managers" of all the schools, will pool the grants (of course largely supplementing them), pay lump sums to the local managers instead of grants per subject, and appoint for the rural schools peripatetic teachers of special subjects. (4) *As a school no longer "elementary,"* Section 1 (1), a, of the technical instruction act no longer applies. The adult scholars who have forgotten their "three R's," and require to be re-taught them side by side with practical and useful subjects, must no longer, as in the past, be excluded from the classes aided by the county councils. No duplication of classes, divisions into upper and lower, are any longer required, and the backward and the advanced are alike eligible for all the benefits of the school.

Into minor details we need not enter. Such is the present state of elementary school affairs.

The University of London progresses slowly with its reorganization. In mere bulk of work, very little has been done; but the machinery of administration, after practically twelve months' deliberation, has at last been fairly started by the appointment of a principal and all but one of the higher officers contemplated in the statutes of the commissioners. After a keen contest between Dr. William Garnett, who was strongly backed by the technical education board of the London county council and the interests which it represents, and Professor Arthur Rücker, the secretary of the Royal Society, who may be said to have stood for the purely academic interests of metropolitan education, the latter was appointed principal of the university. The two existing officials, Dr. H. Frank Heath and Mr. Alfred Milnes, were promoted to the posts of academic and external registrar and two new posts, secretary to the senate and superintendent of examinations, were given respectively to Mr. Percy Wallace and Mr. W. K. Hill. The post of extension registrar is still vacant. With the aid of this enlarged higher staff the senate will endeavor to give effect this session to the flood of schemes poured out since last October by the various faculties, boards of studies, and other standing committees. The first important duty of the senate will be to settle the matriculation scheme for internal students, on the general



principles of which, *i. e.*, a minimum of compulsory and a wide option of facultative subjects, they have already agreed.

The consultative committee would seem to have nearly completed the two important pieces of work assigned to them by the board of education. They have sent in their report on the examination and inspection of schools. As regards the registration of teachers, they have, it is rumored, settled the qualification for admission to the register after the years of grace have passed, and have only to determine the method of registration in the interim period. It is probable that a university degree or its equivalent, in addition to a certificate of training, will be insisted on and that a small standing committee will be appointed to supervise the keeping of the register. Later rumors state there will be a dual register—Class A consisting of teachers who are qualified solely as holders of the government certificate; Class B, of teachers who possess a university degree, and in addition (after the years of grace have expired) a teacher's diploma. As, however, the report of the committee is private and confidential and its conclusions subject to modification—though this is improbable—by the board of education, no authoritative forecast of its contents can yet be given.

The report of the consultative committee on the inspection of schools has already borne fruit. After the usual English manner the first batch of inspections was “done on the cheap”—to use an expressive piece of slang—existing science and art department grant inspectors being employed with the aid of a few “casuals.” The next batch of inspections, held in the county of Surrey, appears to have been conducted on more enlightened lines and gave general satisfaction. All efforts to combine with this work a school science inspection were dropped and the inspectors acted, in the best sense, as educational advisers. After the inspection the inspectors had interviews with the governors of the schools concerned, an excellent innovation likely to be productive of much good, and one which, it is rumored, may be largely developed. Ideally, the inspectorate should have consisted *ab initio* of a strong body of educationists, whose names would have inspired general con-

fidence. That, however, would have been eminently un-English. Accordingly it was only after the inspections mentioned above had been undertaken that a number of well-known names were announced as temporary and *ad hoc* inspectors. These include Dr. Gow, Mr. Arthur Sidgwick, Professor Withers, Messrs. F. E. Kitchener, H. Millington, G. W. Rundall, James Headlam, Mrs. Withiel, and Miss A. J. Cooper.

Since the announcements of these appointments, the first few batches of reports of inspection of secondary schools under the board of education act have been issued and sundry criticisms have naturally been evoked. Among these is a charge of meagerness and lack of breadth of view in the reports. Certain members of the consultative committee are therefore pressing for the appointment of a few permanent inspectors who are men of known eminence or long teaching experience. Meanwhile the Victoria University has appointed an inspecting board of its most eminent professors and teachers, and will probably endeavor to secure its recognition as a "university or other organization," as defined by the act, and thereafter obtain perhaps a monopoly of the inspection work in the north of England.

I come now to the vexed question of an education bill, or, to be more precise, a supplement to the education act which established the board of education and the consultative committee. That act deliberately omitted to create any local authority, and the present agitation is concentrated on the effort to obtain either some local authority appointed *ad hoc*, or the recognition of county councils, duly leavened by experts, as the local authority for education, or, *faute de mieux*, some *modus vivendi* between the school boards and the county councils. The bill of 1900, it will be remembered, was swallowed up in the vortex of the general election last year. The bill (No. 1) of 1901 was "suddenly and unexpectedly" dropped and replaced by a minor (No. 2) bill intended merely to obviate the *impasse* created by the Cockerton judgment. The ostensible reason for dropping bill No. 1 was that it could not have been passed till August, when, in the natural course of parliamentary affairs, there would have been no quorum. The real reason, there can be little

doubt, was the constitutional indifference of the government to a question which has never counted as a factor in the verdict of the polls. Seeing, then, that the bill is dead, it would be useless to discuss its details. But some comments on the general trend of its provisions may be historically and, in view of a big measure promised (as so often before!) for next session, prospectively interesting.

The broad principles of the defunct bill No. 1 are well put in a summary article in the *Journal of Education* for June, and there also will be found a critical symposium on the bill, the educationalists who sit in judgment being authorities on the various aspects of the bill which they treat. As the board of Education bill of 1900 was called a "blank cheque," so the first bill of 1901 has been named a "skeleton bill." As the bill of 1900 constituted a single central authority for all education, so the 1901 bill proposed to establish a single local authority for all education (universities excepted) in each district, and took the first step in this direction. But the education committee of a county or county borough thus created was new only in name, and was, in fact, nothing but the existing technical instruction committee, enlarged by the compulsory co-option of outsiders. The consequent abolition of the fictitious distinction between technical and secondary education "will be welcome as giving the county councils a freer hand." But if this single education committee means the ultimate absorption of school boards, or their relegation to the subordinate position of boards of managers, "it is clear that the constitution of the education committee must be defined by statute, and not left, as it was in the bill, for each county to settle for itself, subject only to the approval of the board of education. Instead of the two co-opted outsiders which would satisfy the letter of the bill, it must contain in sufficient numbers statutory representatives of school boards, representatives of university colleges and polytechnics, where such exist; representatives of other grades of schools, and teachers, private as well as public; and, lastly women representatives—not 'men *or* women,' as the bill had it."

In its financial aspect the bill may be considered retrogres-

sive. The residue under the local taxation act, 1890, was no longer ear-marked, but only "applicable for the purposes of education." On the other hand, the penny rate allowed for technical education was to be raised to twopence, and "any urban district might, presumably in addition to the county rate, raise a penny rate for educational purposes of its own."

Here the writer in the *Journal of Education* touches the essential weakness of this, as it was of the 1900 bill, the absence of compulsion, by which only the righteous are enabled to obtain salvation, and the sinners go unwhipped.

What security is there that the less enlightened counties, which stand most in need of secondary schools, will use the funds created by the bill? There is no compulsion in the bill; no one is held responsible for the educational supply; the children of light will get more light, but the Philistines will be Philistines still.

But no one could have expected more from an opportunist government, whose policy is to secure its own safety in the constituencies by avoiding all tender toes, even at the risk of pleasing no one.

The bill, as it stood, enacts that "an educational authority shall not make it a condition of a grant that any particular form of religious instruction or worship is or is not taught or practiced in a school or college." Further, in all schools established or aided by the rates, there was to be a conscience clause. This provision is not strong enough to prevent denominationalists encroaching upon the interests of unsectarian education, and the slackness here shown is an obvious sop to the government's clerical supporters.

Lastly, the two clauses tacked onto the bill in order to extricate the department from the *impasse* created by the Cockerton judgment are paraphrased thus:

Any school board which is now maintaining higher-grade and evening continuation schools in excess of its legal powers, may apply to the County Council for leave to carry on these schools, and, if leave be granted, may defray the cost of maintenance out of the school fund.

A bitter mortification for the larger school boards, for which the government will, doubtless, pay dearly at the next general election. Moreover, for a whole year from the passing of the

act (had it reached that consummation), no new continuation school could even be contemplated. This would have been a severe blow to the progress of the continuation school movement. Finally, here is the judgment passed by the writer mentioned above, on the bill as a whole. Refusing either to bless the bill with Sir Richard Jebb, or damn it utterly with Mr. Lyulph Stanley, he says :

It clearly points the way to a promised land, though it stands shivering on the brink, and hardly crosses the borders. It creates a local authority for intermediate education which may prove in time to be the local authority for all education; but which may, on the other hand, do nothing, and even obstruct what is being done.

An impartial and, withal, a sane judgment, if not an enthusiastic nor a hopeful one.

But this bill No. 1 was suddenly dropped, as already explained, grouse shooting being at hand, and the government quorum rapidly diminishing, and replaced by a single clause bill (No. 2, as it is called) — not the enabling bill prayed for by the representatives of elementary education, but a bill confirming the Cockerton judgment, and making the county council the authority for continuation and evening schools. This bill No. 2 was forced through the house of commons, discussion being ruthlessly stifled. Its consideration in the Lords was, of course, a farce. But it is doubtful whether the bill will make much difference to the school boards, as in almost every case the county councils will agree to continue the *status quo* for twelve months. Some of the larger school boards threaten to discontinue their “Cockerton schools” rather than apply for permission to the county councils; but the need for beginning the winter session at once, if it is to begin at all, will probably ensure a truce of God for twelve months at least, during which the “Cockerton schools” will either “make their wills” or set their forces in array for battle.

I will close my letter with a reference to the unique and princely benefaction which has fallen to the lot of Scotland—two million pounds sterling from Mr. Carnegie, to be placed under the control of a body of trustees, with provision for modi-

fication of the trust to suit future needs. At present half the income is to go towards improving and expanding the universities in the way of buildings, professorships, and equipment. The other half is to be devoted to paying fees and otherwise maintaining university students. The distinctive feature of this benefaction is not so much its abnormal amount as the measure which that abnormality gives of the vastly increased importance now attached to education as a factor in national development. Could the world but see it, no object of philanthropic effort has a claim superior to that of education, whatever its grade, nor is there any seed sown on the face of the earth more likely to bring forth fruit in due season a hundredfold.

WILLIAM K. HILL.

GARDNOR HOUSE,  
Hampstead, London, England.